AN

# EXAMINATION

OF

## MR. WAKEFIELD'S

## *REPLY*

TO THE

## BISHOP OF LANDAFF'S

## *ADDRESS.*

BY JOHN RANBY, ESQUIRE.

London:

PRINTED FOR JOHN STOCKDALE, PICCADILLY.

1798.

[*Price One Shilling and Sixpence.*]

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

54.
9 29.
471.

# ADVERTISEMENT.

WHILST I was writing the following ſheets, I learned from a newſpaper, that a bill of indictment was found againſt the publiſher of Mr. Wakefield's Reply. In this, however, I ſaw no reaſon againſt my finiſhing this Examination of it. It is for the proſecutor to prove Mr. Wakefield's Reply to be an ill-intentioned and miſchievous libel: I denounce it to the public as an ill-written, and (except in one ſolitary inſtance) an inconcluſive compoſition. Beſides, a libel frequently becoming more popular by the puniſhment of the printer, the condemnation of a court of juſtice does not produce the deſired effect of ſuppreſſing the miſchief, unleſs the ſentence be confirmed by the public taſte conſigning the publication to oblivion. A pamphlet, which is the ſubject of

proſecution, is not always to be procured. I have therefore printed the extracts from the "Reply" more according to the tenor than I ſhould otherwiſe have thought neceſſary; not that they are now printed ſtrictly according to the tenor; but I have not intentionally omitted any thing which ſeemed to me material.

St. Edmund's Bury,
Feb. 19, 1798.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

AN

# EXAMINATION,

*&c.*

THE Biſhop of Landaff has publiſhed "An "Addreſs to the People of Great Britain," on ſome political points highly intereſting; of which the principal are—

1. The plan for raiſing a conſiderable part of the ſupplies within the year.

2. The expediency of paying off a great part of the national debt in a few years, by calling for a ſufficient portion of every man's whole property.

3. The

3. The juſtice and neceſſity of continuing the war, without regard to the juſtice or neceſſity of commencing it.

4. The probable event of an invaſion by the enemy.

5. The declared motives and purpoſes of this invaſion.

6. The attempts of bad men to rob us of our religion and our government.

7. The reaſonableneſs of diſtinctions in ſociety with reſpect to rank and riches.

Mr. Gilbert Wakefield has publiſhed a Reply to ſome parts of this Addreſs.

Theſe points in diſpute being of general importance to the community, it may be of ſome uſe to extract from each pamphlet the poſitions and arguments both for and againſt them. And I hope that I ſhall not be thought preſumptuous in occaſionally hazarding an opinion; becauſe it is not to be ſuppoſed that ſuch diſtinguiſhed writers as the Biſhop of Landaff and Mr. Wakefield have addreſſed any thing to the people of Great Britain which

a reader

a reader of common capacity cannot underſtand. Indeed, if from a diſcuſſion between men of ſo great and deſerved literary reputation there be much difficulty in diſcovering the truth, the generality of people may ſpare themſelves the trouble of ſearching for it as an uſeleſs labour.

Before I begin to remark upon either publication, I muſt obſerve, that the title of Mr. Wakefield's Reply promiſes only a limited diſcuſſion. The expreſſion, *a reply to ſome parts*, neceſſarily implies that other parts are left unanſwered. Whether Mr. Wakefield neglected thoſe paſſages as unworthy of notice, or becauſe he found them unanſwerable, every reader, who attentively conſiders the temper and language of his Reply, may judge for himſelf.

Mr. Wakefield prefaces his remarks with ſaying *(Rep.* p. 4 *& ſeq.)*, "that he may have "juſter conceptions on the points in diſpute "than the Biſhop of Landaff, on account of "their different ſituations. For, by an eſſen- "tial change in the preſent ſyſtem of go- "vernment, whether it were the reſult of "foreign invaſion, anarchy, or radical reform, "the Biſhop would loſe his preſent preferment,

"and

" and his proſpect of advancement; and there-
" fore this *intereſt* will naturally prevent his
" clearly ſeeing the imperfections of our
" eſtabliſhment, which muſt appear more
" eligible to him than the dangerous alterna-
" tive of reformation." Aſſuredly the Biſhop of Landaff has ſomething to loſe; and were the expediency of maintaining or overturning our preſent form of government the only queſtion in diſpute, I admit that his intereſt might miſlead his judgment. But ſeveral points in his Addreſs relate to the means of defending our country and government (upon a preſumption that they ought to be defended) againſt an enemy who threatens to plunder the one and overthrow the other. Now, ſuppoſing it to be proper that the country ſhould be defended, I do not eſteem a man leſs able to point out good means of defence becauſe he is intereſted in their ſucceſs. On the contrary, intereſt is naturally quick-ſighted and active; and whenever we are ſure that a man's intereſt goes with us, we commonly think ourſelves ſecure of all his beſt mental and bodily exertions. The hint at the Biſhop's proſpect of advancement, although invidious, is ſcarce worth noticing, becauſe that proſpect can raiſe little or no intereſt in the mind of a man ſo

con-

converſant in calculation * as is the Biſhop of Landaff.

Having thus examined what Mr. Wakefield ſays of the Biſhop's ſituation, let us now ſee what he ſays of his own.

*Rep.* p. 7. "With the continuance of our "moſt *happy* conſtitution in church and ſtate, "our portion † is, the ſure abhorrence of all "good churchmen: perſecution, and probably "impriſonment, or even military execution in "no long time hence, if we preſume to aſſert "the unalienable privilege of independent "man in an open declaration of our ſenti-"ments: or at leaſt, an abſolute inſulation, "through legal tyranny or popular opprobrium, "from the reaſonable benefits of ſociety: in "ſhort, letters and philoſophy, with neglect "and poverty, muſt be our lot."

By the rules of pamphleteering, I might here lengthen my work by controverting Mr. Wakefield's unalienable privilege, compliment-ing him on the extent of his literature, and

* I allude to the Biſhop's time of life, and the expenſe immediately incurred by a tranſlation.

† Mr. Wakefield (I preſume) here ſpeaks of men of letters diſſenting from the eſtabliſhed church.

diſputing the *quantum* of his philoſophy. But I paſs over theſe topics, for they come not within the ſcope of this Examination *.

But if this be (I hope it is not) a juſt repreſentation of the ſituation and ſentiments of diſſenting men of letters; moſt certainly they have not much to loſe either by a partial change, or a total ſubverſion of this "our moſt *happy* "conſtitution:" I therefore readily admit that, as far as the fear of loſs may operate, the Biſhop of Landaff is intereſted, and Mr. Wakefield is not.

But hope can influence the mind as powerfully as fear. Mr. Wakefield ſeems to be convinced that he cannot *loſe:* is it clear that he is equally ſatisfied that he may not *gain* by a change? To be relieved from the perſecution, the privations, and poverty, which Mr. Wakefield ſo feelingly deſcribes, would be, in my mind, a poſitive benefit, and a conſiderable gain in an eſtimate of my worldly ſituation. But I may not judge for Mr. Wakefield; and he tells

* Except in ſome few inſtances, I mean to confine my examination as cloſely as poſſible to the matter of the Addreſs, and the objections ſtated in the Reply. For it would ſwell this work too much to follow Mr. Wakefield in all the digreſſions he has thought fit to make.

us (*Rep.* pp. 7, 8.), that—"On the other hand, "from a ſubverſion of the government by fo- "reign or domeſtic violence, our portion would "be, a fearful expectation of thoſe tremen- "dous evils, which appear to no man more "formidable than to the ſequeſtered ſtudent, "whoſe *dear delight** is peace." To be ſure, if this be ſo; if he ſhould only change his preſent ſtate of perſecution, privations, and poverty, for a ſtate of fearful expectation of tremendous evils, he would not get much by the bargain. But why may not Mr. Wakefield hope for better things? Let him turn his eyes to France. Can he derive no encouragement or ſecret expectation from the aſtoniſhing fluctuation of power, pre-eminence, and property, which have taken place in that country, where (to uſe the party cant of the times) a complete and radical reform has been ſo happily effected? There the men of letters †, inſtead of clinging to

Peace, the ſequeſter'd ſtudent's dear delight——

or ſitting ſtill in fearful expectation of tremen-

---

* Peace is my dear delight, not Prieſtley's more;
But touch me, and no miniſter ſo ſore.

† Bailly — Champfort — Le Brun—Briſſot—Chenier—Fabre d'Eglantine—Camille des Moulins—Leignelot—Gorſas—Grovelle, &c. &c.

dous evils, were themſelves among the moſt active promoters of thoſe evils, were the moſt forward in the buſieſt and bloodieſt ſcenes of the revolution, and openly rioted in power and profits enormous beyond all example.

Even from the concluſion of Mr. Wakefield's argument on this topic of intereſt, I cannot but infer that, if the Biſhop of Landaff ſees a proſpect of advancement in the maintenance of our conſtitution, Mr. Wakefield has ſome proſpect of gratification from the ſubverſion of it. For he there ſays, (p. 8.)—" The propoſed queſ-" tion (of maintenance or ſubverſion) may ex-" hibit itſelf to one (himſelf) as a *neutral* poſi-" tion of *general utility and public happineſs*; " but can hardly fail to be blended by the " other (the Biſhop of Landaff) with an adul-" terated infuſion of perſonal accommodation " and preſent intereſt."

Mr. Wakefield, in the firſt page of his Reply, profeſſes to owe a great reverence to patriotiſm; and I will not hold his profeſſion ſo cheap as not to ſuppoſe, that he has a ſtrong *intereſt* in the promoting of any plan of " ge-" neral utility and public happineſs," even if he had no chance of perſonal accommodation or conſequent intereſt.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, Fear and hope of pecuniary loſs or gain are not the only motives by which the minds of men may be ſo ſtrongly intereſted as to become liable to partiality and error. Often are our intellects deeply and dangerouſly overclouded and deceived by party ſpirit, party connexions, and party profeſſions; and from theſe impreſſions Mr. Wakefield ſeems to be by no means exempt.

My readers will, I fear, complain of my dwelling ſo long upon a preliminary obſervation: but it was abſolutely neceſſary for the purpoſe of ſecuring a fair hearing. Two diſputants do not engage on equal terms, if the one have an apparent intereſt in the event of the queſtion, and the other be perfectly diſintereſted: for one will be liſtened to with ſuſpicion and reluctance, the other with too ready an acquieſcence. The Biſhop of Landaff clearly has an intereſt in the ſubject of his Addreſs;—a juſtifiable intereſt I think, becauſe it prompts him to aſſiſt in the defence of our government;—ſtill it *is* an intereſt. If my preceding remarks be well founded, I have ſhown that the author of the Reply has, upon his own ſtatement of his ſituation and ſentiments, a *ſtrong* intereſt on the oppoſite ſide, the ſubverſion of our government.

*Add.*

*Add.* p. 1.—" The ſentiments which I ſhall, " in this Addreſs, take the liberty of ſtating to " you on ſome intereſting points, will, I hope, " meet with your candid attention; if not from " their worth, from the conſideration that they " are the ſentiments of an independent man."

Upon this his firſt quotation from the Addreſs, Mr. Wakefield obſerves, (*Rep.* p. 10.) that—" Undoubtedly, if the conteſt be pre- " ſumed to ſubſiſt between one miniſtry and " another, the Biſhop of Landaff may be " deemed, as much as any man ſimilarly ſitu- " ated, an independent man."

Had the quotation from the Addreſs been fully, and, therefore, fairly made, Mr. Wakefield would have had nothing to reply to. For the Biſhop adds, (*Add.* pp. 1, 2.)—" I am " neither the friend or enemy of any party in " the ſtate. No favour which I could receive " from this or from any adminiſtration would " induce me to ſupport meaſures which I diſ- " liked; nor will any neglect I may experience " impel me to oppoſe meaſures which I ap- " prove."—Here the Biſhop of Landaff aſſerts nothing more than that he is independent of any influence ariſing from the favour or

neglect

neglect of any adminiſtration; and this aſſertion Mr. Wakefield does not deny.

I do not, however, mean to evade the reſt of Mr. Wakefield's obſervation.

*Rep.* p. 11.—"The preſent conteſt (I give "the ſubſtance) is no longer between two par- "ties in and out of place, but between *princi-* "*ples*, between corruption and reformation. "The preſent miniſtry, and the abuſes in "church and ſtate, are indiviſibly interwoven "with each other, ſo that every man who pro- "fits by thoſe abuſes is not an independent, "but an intereſted ſupporter of our exiſting "forms."

How far Mr. Wakefield really thinks that "the preſent conteſt is no longer between two "parties in and out of place," will be ſeen when I come to examine the concluſion of his Reply.

For the preſent, and with reſpect to any conteſt ſtated in the Addreſs, I deny Mr. Wakefield's poſition in all its parts.

1ſt. I ſay that the conteſt, which is the ſubject of the Biſhop of Landaff's Addreſs, is a conteſt

conteſt between Great Britain and France, two countries at open war. And Mr. Wakefield, in replying to this Addreſs, cannot, upon any principle of juſt reaſoning, ſubſtitute another conteſt of his own choice and deſcription, for the purpoſe of furniſhing himſelf with materials for his Reply.

2dly. I deny that the conteſt, as ſtated by Mr. Wakefield, makes any part of our conteſt with France; until he ſhall prove that the one conteſt would be decided by the other; or, in other words, that the ſucceſs of France over this country would ſuppreſs the *ſuppoſed* corruption, and produce the propoſed reformation.

3dly. I deny that the *ſuppoſed* abuſes in church and ſtate are indiviſibly interwoven with the preſent miniſtry, until Mr. Wakefield ſhall prove that a new miniſtry, even were it compoſed of his own friends, muſt neceſſarily ſuppreſs thoſe abuſes. For, whatever may be Mr. Wakefield's opinion of the probity of his party, long and repeated experience has ſhown the world, that the promiſes of men out of place differ widely from their performance when in place. Whether this be unavoidable, or whether it be from want of power or of inclination,

clination, I know not; but ſuch has been, I believe I may ſay, invariably the event.

Laſtly. I deny that a clergyman beneficed, and ſo far pecuniarily intereſted in the ſupport of our preſent form of government, is therefore dependent upon the miniſtry; until Mr. Wakefield ſhall prove, that the continuance of our preſent form of government depends upon the continuance of the preſent miniſtry. And if Mr. Wakefield ſhould prove this, if he ſhould convince the public that the preſent form of government muſt neceſſarily fall with the preſent miniſtry, I doubt if his political favourites will hold themſelves much indebted to his ingenuity.

*Add.* p. 2.—" A new ſyſtem of finance has " this year been introduced; and I fairly own " it has my approbation as far as it goes."

*Rep.* p. 12.—" Abſtractedly conſidered (Mr. " Wakefield ſays), it is a juſt and wiſe meaſure " to raiſe within the year the expenſes of that " year, &c.: but this meaſure was not adopted " by Mr. Pitt either for its wiſdom or its juſ- " tice; but becauſe the funding ſyſtem can be " purſued no longer, &c. &c."

But if the meaſure be juſt and wiſe, as Mr. Wakefield admits it to be, it ſeems not to be at all material in what light it may be conſidered, or from what motive it was adopted.

Mr. Wakefield approves it, abſtractedly conſidered: the Biſhop of Landaff approves it, perhaps, collectively conſidered: and ſince both parties do approve, it is no proper ſubject of reply.

*Add.* p. 2.—" I lament the neceſſity of im-
" poſing ſo heavy a burden on the community;
" and with a family of eight children, *I ſhall*
" *feel the preſſure as much as moſt men*; but I
" am ſo far from cenſuring the miniſter for
" having done ſo much, that I ſincerely wiſh
" he had done a great deal more. Inſtead of
" calling for a tenth of a man's income, I wiſh
" the miniſter had called for a tenth or ſuch
" other portion of every man's whole property,
" as would have enabled him not merely to
" make a temporary proviſion for the war, but
" to have paid off in a few years, the whole or
" the greateſt part of the national debt."

*Rep.* p. 14.—" A ſtrange ſtatement indeed,
" from a man of ſo much good ſenſe and ſa-
" gacity!"

To ſhow the fallacy of this ſtatement, Mr. Wakefield puts the caſe between two men of numerous families, of whom the one has 200*l.* and the other 2000*l.* per ann. "The former can "provide no more than the actual neceſſaries of "life; deduct therefore a tenth part from his in- "come, and you diſtreſs him beyond deſcription. "But deduct a tenth from the income of the lat- "ter, and you abridge only his ſuperfluities or "accumulation. He has his remedy in retrench- "ment, without loſing a ſingle comfort."

To me, the reply to this point ſeems juſt and concluſive; for the ſuppoſed caſe clearly ſhows, that the preſſure would be far from equal.

Mr. Wakefield adds, that "it will apply "more cogently to property than to income."

To property employed in a profitable trade, I clearly ſee that it will; but not to property lying at common intereſt; at leaſt I do not perceive this.

I further obſerve that the ſtatement of the miniſter's plan is not correct. For the miniſter has *not* called for a tenth of every man's income; in many inſtances he has called for no part of a man's income, in many for much leſs

than a tenth part, but in no inſtance does he call for more: a tenth is the extreme point of the plan.

*Add.* pp. 3, 4.—" When all the members of " a community are proportionably reduced, the " relation between the individuals, as to the " quantum of each man's property, remaining " unaltered, the individuals themſelves will feel " no elevation or depreſſion in the ſcale of ſo- " ciety. When all the foundations of a great " building ſink uniformly, the ſymmetry of the " parts is not injured; the preſſure on each " member remains as it was; no rupture is " made; the building will not be ſo lofty, but " it may ſtand on better ground."

*Rep.* p. 16. — " The compariſon is elegant " and ingenious, but not appoſite to the Bi- " ſhop's inference in ſome trivial particulars. " For, alas! the ground-floor of this grand and " ſtable edifice, where myſelf and my *meſs-mates* " *of the ſwiniſh multitude* were regaling our- " ſelves, as well as exiſting circumſtances would " poſſibly admit, on our cheeſe-parings and " candles' ends; our ground floor, I ſay, is ſunk " for ever in damps and darkneſs."

Here Mr. Wakefield has evidently laboured to draw a ſtriking contraſt, nor has he laboured in vain.

vain. For if the Biſhop of Landaff's compariſon be elegant and ingenious; there is certainly no elegance in "damps and darkneſs, cheeſe-"parings and candles' ends:" nor is there much ingenuity in enlarging upon a compariſon prepared to one's hand.

Of the ſtate of the ground-floor—in plainer Engliſh, the inferior claſſes of the community—Mr. Wakefield has ſpoken more fully in a ſubſequent paſſage, for which I ſhall reſerve my remarks.

But "my meſs-mates of the ſwiniſh multi-"tude" muſt not paſs unnoticed.

The "ſwiniſh multitude," we all know, were words dropt by Mr. Burke in the ardour of debate; we all know too how eagerly they were caught up by a diſaffected party, and uſed as a watch-word to irritate the paſſions of the populace. The expreſſion might fairly be explained in a manner that would render it leſs exceptionable than it appears to be, but it cannot be juſtified: for it caſts contempt on the ſtate of the inferior orders of the people; and no ſtate, wherein a man is born and bred, can be a proper object of contempt. But when Mr. Wakefield repreſents *himſelf* to be a *meſs-mate* with the ſwiniſh multitude, he ſurely is not in earneſt.

earneſt. Does he really believe himſelf to be ſo? Does he believe that any man thinks him to be ſo? Would he ſuffer any man to ſpeak thus of him without expreſſing his juſt indignation? His means are unknown to me; but do not his learning, his profeſſion and character, all pointedly contradict him? His aim in aſſuming this tranſient humility of character is indeed ſufficiently obvious. But was it worthy of Mr. Wakefield to deſcend to ſuch a paltry artifice for the purpoſe of ingratiating himſelf with ſuch few readers as he may find among the populace, and of miſleading them into a belief that his cauſe is completely common with their own?

*Add.* p. 6.—"I have lately converſed with a "variety of men, in different ſtations, and in "different parts of the kingdom, and have "ſcarcely met with one among the landed "gentry, and with none among the manufac-"turers, tradeſmen, farmers, and artificers of "the country, who has not declared that he "had much rather pay his portion of the princi-"pal of the national debt, than be haraſſed "for the payment of the intereſt of it."

*Rep.* p. 17.—"Indeed! why, the generality "of people ſpecified in this deſcription have no

"ſuch

" ſuch portion in their power, no hoard, no " ſecret ſtock to draw from. Their income is " ſucceſſive and precarious. We can contrive, " but with difficulty, peradventure, to fur- " niſh a guinea for each month; but if you " come upon us for twelve guineas, in a maſs, " we have them not. But if this be true of *in-* " *come*, how much more of property?

" I proteſt ſolemnly, when I obſerve what " ſeems to me ſuch abſolute ignorance of the " ſtate of ſociety in this country, and ſuch out- " rageous defiance of the moſt notorious facts, " I begin to doubt whether my ideas be not ab- " ſolutely bewildered, and my intellect eſſen- " tially diſordered in its functions; eſpecially " when I conſider the character of the writer."

The inſtance brought by Mr. Wakefield, to ſhow the difference between paying one guinea monthly and twelve guineas at once, is not a full objection to the propoſed plan; becauſe the Biſhop of Landaff admits * the neceſſity of modifications to his plan; and property below a much greater value than what is ſtated in the inſtance, muſt be reaſonably ſuppoſed to be wholly exempted.

* Addreſs, p. 7.

On

On the other hand, to property of a large amount Mr. Wakefield's reaſoning does not apply at all. For an individual poſſeſſed of (ſay) 50,000*l.* could certainly upon reaſonable notice produce 5000*l.* in a maſs.

Nor do I agree with Mr. Wakefield, that there is "no ſuch portion, no hoard, no ſe-"cret ſtock to draw from." On the contrary, I have no doubt but that, excluſive of land, there is a very large maſs of perſonal property; money, manufactures, and other merchandiſe, in the hands of perſons who might well ſpare a tenth part of it, upon due notice, without much inconvenience, and, for ſuch a purpoſe, without much reluctance. But as taxes muſt be paid in money, it ſeems to me that the impoſition of ſuch a tax would increaſe the demand for money to ſuch an incalculable degree, that this property could not be diſpoſed of but at a loſs that would, inſtead of a tenth, take away one half, or perhaps more, from every owner. It is not the want of property, but the want of a market, that ſuggeſts itſelf to me as the greateſt obſtacle to the Biſhop of Landaff's plan; and this obſtacle ſeems to me inſurmountable.

"The conſideration of the character of the "writer" has perhaps as great weight with me

as

as with Mr. Wakefield. In the early part of my life, when I was at Trinity College, I was acquainted with the Biſhop of Landaff; very ſlightly indeed, but quite enough to give me a perfect confidence in his veracity. I ſhould therefore not have the ſmalleſt doubt of the truth of his aſſertion, even if I did not (as I in fact do) recollect to have myſelf heard the ſame ſort of language held more than once, although not lately. Such diſcourſe ſeemed to me little worthy of attention; becauſe I conſidered it as proceeding either from temporary diſguſt at ſome new taxes, that were perhaps even more troubleſome than burdenſome; or from ſome confuſed idea of great advantage that would be found in the reduced price of every article of conſumption, which it was ſuppoſed would neceſſarily take place, but (I have at this moment a particular converſation in my mind) without any conſideration of the means and difficulty of raiſing the principal ſum neceſſary. I can ſcarcely think that the Biſhop of Landaff would argue from ſuch looſe converſations as I have deſcribed; and yet I can as little conceive how in the preſent ſtate of the country any ſuch propoſition could be ſeriouſly maintained upon inquiry and argument.

*Add.* p. 11.—" Whatever doubts I formerly " entertained, or may ſtill entertain, either on

 " the

" the juſtice or the neceſſity of commencing " this war in which we are engaged, I entertain " none on the preſent neceſſity and juſtice of " continuing it. Under whatever circum- " ſtances the war was begun, it is now become " juſt; ſince the enemy has refuſed to treat, " on equitable terms, for the reſtoration of " peace."

*Rep.* p. 19.—" I moſt peremptorily deny, that " a fair trial has been made of the diſpoſition " of the enemy."

If on any point in diſpute, a propoſal is given in by one party, this ſeems a direct method of aſking or trying if the other party be diſpoſed to ſettle the diſpute: for, if he *be* ſo diſpoſed, he will naturally either diſcuſs that propoſal, or offer ſome other: if he be *not* ſo diſpoſed, he will do neither. And this was preciſely the conduct of the French miniſters at Liſle; they would neither negotiate on our terms, nor propoſe any terms of their own; therefore I ſay, they had no diſpoſition to treat.

*Rep.* pp. 19, 20.—" I aſſert, that no enemy " whatſoever, ſimilarly circumſtanced with the " French, could be expected to diſcover a con- " ciliatory diſpoſition towards the negotiators " on

" on the late occaſion. Now this is a very
" principal and intereſting topic, and well wor-
" thy a more minute examination, as involving
" moſt materially the main queſtion of juſtice
" and neceſſity, as to the point under contem-
" plation.

" Let us ſee then, whether it be not eaſy to
" ſuggeſt ſeveral ſtrong preſumptive arguments
" to evince, that miniſters not only *were* not
" ſincere, but in the nature of things, morally
" ſpeaking, *could not poſſibly* be ſincere in their
" overtures for peace."

I mean not to follow Mr. Wakefield through his minute examination, which he has ſpun into eight pages: becauſe, 1ſt, the ſincerity of our miniſtry, and the inſincerity of the French in the negotiation of Liſle was proved, almoſt to the very ſilencing of oppoſition, by Mr. Pitt in his ſpeech on the addreſs of the Houſe of Commons upon the event of that negotiation. At leaſt if he failed, I have not vanity enough to engage in an argument which Mr. Pitt could not maintain. 2dly, The iſſue of that negotiation did not in any degree depend upon the ſincerity or inſincerity of our miniſtry; but on a circumſtance which could not be affected by either.

Many weeks (even months) before the concluſion of the negotiation, it was notorious both in England and France, that the French Directory was (as it generally muſt be) divided into two parties ſtruggling for power. The one, headed by Carnot, was favourably diſpoſed to peace: the other, headed by Barras, was determined on war. On the fourth of September, Carnot and Barthelemy were arreſted; and on the ſixteenth Lord Malmeſbury was directed by the French miniſtry to return in twenty-four hours to England. The ſending of him for fuller powers was a moſt ſhallow pretence; and the affectation of the French miniſters waiting there in expectation of his return, was an inſulting farce. For they knew that he would not return with any ſuch powers as they required; he had told them two months before that no ſuch powers would be given to him, and they had quietly for two months acquieſced in that anſwer.

Mr. Wakefield's minute examination is therefore a mere vehicle of abuſe againſt the miniſtry, unfounded, ſcandalous, and *impertinent*; I uſe the word in its ſtrict ſenſe, for it is perfectly irrelevant to the queſtion propoſed, "the trial of the diſpoſition of the French Di-"rectory to peace."

*Add.*

*Add.* p. 13.—" Were there even a bridge " over the channel, France durſt not make an " incurſion with half her numbers. She knows " how ready her neighbours would be to re- " venge the injuries they have ſuſtained—how " ready her own citizens would be to regain the " bleſſings they have loſt, could they once " ſee all her forces occupied in a diſtant coun- " try."

*Rep.* p. 30.—" If this feat were indeed ac- " compliſhed, the moſt ſanguine wiſhes of the " republicans would be gratified. The ſolici- " tude, I trow, of Buonaparte and his columns, " (unrivalled captain! unconquerable heroes!) " does not turn upon, *what numbers we ſhould* " *oppoſe againſt him*, but *how he can get at us.* " No great expectation will be formed of Eng- " liſh proweſs on its own ground, with all our " ſwaggering pretenſions, by thoſe who recol- " lect the adventures of about 9000 raggamuffin " breechleſs loons from Scotland, but a few " years ago."

And has Mr. Wakefield himſelf no ſwag- gering pretenſions? May I not, for inſtance, juſtly ſuſpect his profeſſed " reverence of pa- " triotiſm" to be nothing more than a ſwagger- ing pretenſion? To my apprehenſion, this en-

thuſiaſtic *Io Pæan* to Buonaparte and his unconquerable heroes, this contemptuous ſneer at the idea of Britiſh proweſs, breathes nothing of the ſpirit of patriotiſm. But I beg Mr. Wakefield's pardon; I will not diſpute his pretenſion to patriotiſm. For no queſtion can be fairly argued unleſs both parties are agreed upon a definition of its terms; and Mr. Wakefield and I certainly do not underſtand the word patriotiſm in the ſame ſenſe.

Mr. Wakefield, in replying further to this paſſage, has indulged himſelf in a vein of humour, which, I confeſs, does not excite *my* riſibility. But as Mr. Wakefield is a man of reputed good taſte, and does himſelf evidently eſteem this paſſage of his Reply to be extremely comical, I will give my readers the enjoyment of peruſing it at full length.

*Rep.* pp. 30, 31. "Though the Biſhop of "Landaff will prove, I doubt not, a ſecond "Ulyſſes at the leaſt, too many of us, I fear, "will, alas! reſemble the ſatyrs in Euripides, "who had made loud and boaſtful profeſſions of "their readineſs to aſſiſt the hero in burning "the eye of Polyphemus, but miſerably failed "in the performance of their engagement "when the hour of experiment was come. *Do*

"*but*

" *but ſee*, ſays one (a city light-horſeman), *what*
" *a long way I am off! It is impoſſible for me to*
" *reach him.—Oh! what a ſudden lameneſs has*
" *ſeized my poor leg! ſays another* (a ſupple-
" mentary militiaman).—*Aye! and mine too!*
" *ſays a third* (a voluntary cavalier); *a moſt un-*
" *accountable ſpaſm began to contract my feet juſt*
" *as I was ready.—And theſe eyes of mine, ex-*
" *claims another* (a provincial aſſociator), *are*
" *full of aſhes from ſome inexplicable cauſe or*
" *other.—The truth is, ſaid a fifth* (a life and
" fortune man), *it is a generous compaſſion for*
" *our bones that ſuggeſts theſe excuſes; but I am*
" *acquainted with a charm of Orpheus, a moſt ad-*
" *mirable ſpecific! which will teach the brand how*
" *to march at once of its own accord, and put out*
" *his eye!*"

I do not ſuppoſe that this inſtallation of the Biſhop of Landaff into the character of Ulyſſes, is to be conſidered as forming any part of his " proſpect of advancement." For, beſides that the character of Ulyſſes is not clerical, it is compounded of various qualities, whereof ſome are neither very amiable nor very honourable. It is therefore by no means clear to me, whether Mr. Wakefield here means compliment or ridicule.—If the latter, I can only ſay that an ambiguous joke is but little, if at all,

better

better than no joke. Until this point be ſettled, the Biſhop, inſtead of either making his bow, or taking any offence, need only recollect the trite quotation,

——— " timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."

The paſſage from Euripides is, I have no doubt, faithfully tranſlated; partly, becauſe I believe Mr. Wakefield to be an excellent Greek ſcholar; and partly, becauſe I have heard it remarked by ſcholars, that the theatrical humour of the Greeks was often offenſively groſs, vulgar, and bordering upon inſipidity. As to the intrinſic merit of this piece of pleaſantry, I do not pretend to ſay that it might not, if delivered by a good performer (the late Mr. Shuter, for inſtance), produce ſome merriment and laughter, eſpecially in the upper gallery; but then it requires the powerful aid of Shuter's ſquints, and ſqueaks, and grins. Nay, I queſtion if even Mr. Shuter would have liked to hazard it on the ſtage. He would rather, I think, have reſerved it for his choſen companions at the pot-houſe, or gin-ſhop, to which he commonly reſorted to finiſh the evening after his performance.

So much for the humour of this elegant, well-choſen ſample of Greek literature.

Let

Let me now ſay a few words on the poignancy and propriety of Mr. Wakefield's application.

The ſeveral volunteer *corps*, to which Mr. Wakefield alludes, have never been tried againſt an enemy; upon what principle of judging then does he preſume them to be runaways and cowards? I myſelf belong to a troop of volunteer cavalry, and I have been hitherto ſo fortunate as to paſs through life without having had occaſion to know whether I have the proper courage of a man or not; but I feel no conſciouſneſs that I ſhall fear to do my duty; and I preſume the minds and feelings of my comrades to be ſuch as my own. In this preſumption I follow the reaſonable and (as I think) the almoſt invariable rule of judging of others by myſelf.

*Rep.* pp. 32, 33.—" I conſider that inſinua-
" tion of the domineering terrors of the French
" army, and a ſecret willingneſs in a conſider-
" able part of the French nation to reſtore
" royalty, as a notion perfectly unſubſtantial,
" contradicted alike by the teſtimony of tra-
" vellers and undiſputed fact. The armies of
" France have been the moſt ſtrenuous ſup-
" porters of republicaniſm. Theſe armies were

" not, like ours, a collection of the vagabonds " and outcasts of society, mere profligate mer- " cenaries (the common men I mean), but a " selection from all the orders of citizens by a " rigorous requisition; and of course may be " regarded as an adequate and fair representa- " tive of the whole community. What should " have hindered *them* from reinstating mo- " narchy, had they been so perversely in- " clined?"

I could extract from the accounts of travellers, several anecdotes and stories, some of which mark in the French a regret for their ancient government, and many more prove a very general discontent with their present rulers. The most probable opinion seems to be, that the nation, exclusive of the army and those in power or office, harassed and wearied out by successive revolutions, and mortified at seeing peace, property, and indeed every thing else, sacrificed to the support and gratification of the armies, would joyfully submit to any form of government that might revive the trade of the country, and could hold out a reasonable hope of security to the lives and property of the inhabitants, who have been long awakened from their dreams of political liberty and equality. But although the nation groans under a tyranny,

grievously

grievouſly aggravated by the revolution in laſt September; yet I believe it to be too univerſally diſpirited to take any ſtep towards its deliverance. The army alone can (and, in the end, certainly will) undo the miſchief it has done.

"Not ſo," ſays Mr. Wakefield; "for the "armies of France have been the moſt ſtrenuous "ſupporters of republicaniſm; a ſelection from "all orders of citizens; an adequate and fair "repreſentative of the whole community!"

I am not one of thoſe who conſider ſoldiers either as mere machines, or as men ready at all times to deal in the trade of war, without any regard to the cauſe for which they fight; on the contrary, I believe ſoldiers to be as capable of attachment to the honour and welfare of their country as other men; but then they are alſo as liable to be deceived and miſled as other men, who have not had the advantages of inſtruction and reflection. Over the opinions of ſuch men, generals commonly have, and, indeed, ought to have, a very powerful influence; and popular generals, of great armies, have not always proved the moſt ſtrenuous ſupporters of republicaniſm.

But, " the French armies repreſent the whole " community."

This newly enlightened age of reaſon has, among other ſtrange productions, brought forth many crude, miſchievous, and impracticable notions of a national repreſentation; but ſurely the mind of man never conceived a more ſingular or contradictory idea, than that ſoldiers, forced into the line by a rigorous requiſition, form an adequate and fair repreſentative of the whole community! I admit that the decrees of requiſition in France made all orders of citizens liable to the ſelection, like the ballot in our militia acts; but I do not believe, for it is almoſt paſt belief, that men who could pay for and find ſubſtitutes ever ſerved as common ſoldiers of the line. Further, I can ſafely and poſitively aver, that I have ſeen, more than once, in the printed reports of the French committee of war, complaints of the exceſſive deſertion of the requiſition men, and repreſentations of the neceſſity of ſending troops to compel them to join their colours; nay, it is notorious that numbers were marched in handcuffs to their reſpective regiments; a moſt diſgraceful, and, as I ſhould think, a moſt unconſtitutional method of inculcating the doctrines of true patriotiſm and republicaniſm! It brings to my mind

mind a ſtory of a couple of old Highland ſoldiers, who were ſeen beating their nephew moſt unmercifully, in order, as they ſaid, to make him a volunteer.

Laſtly, To Mr. Wakefield's triumphant queſtion—" What ſhould have hindered *them* (the " armies) from reinſtating monarchy, had they " been ſo inclined?" I anſwer—" Becauſe they " were *not* ſo inclined." I believe Mr. Wakefield could not wiſh for an anſwer more to his mind; and yet he is not a whit the nearer proving the point he aims at.

For now the argument ſtands thus: the Addreſs ſays—" The nation would free itſelf if the " armies were abſent." The Reply ſays—" The " armies are an adequate and fair repreſentative " of the nation; but the armies have not freed " the nation, therefore the nation would not " free itſelf."

Having conſidered Mr. Wakefield's proofs, I deny the firſt propoſition of his argument; and if that propoſition ſtill remains maintainable, " I ſhall (to borrow Mr. Wakefield's " words*) doubt whether *my* ideas too be not " abſolutely bewildered, and my intellect eſſen- " tially diſordered in its functions."

*Add.*

* See Reply, p. 18.

*Add.* p. 15.—" If I were aſked whether an " equal number of Engliſhmen would beat theſe " conquerors of Italy, I would anſwer as an " Engliſh ambaſſador anſwered a king of Pruſ- " ſia, when, at a review of his forces, he aſked " the ambaſſador whether he thought that an " equal number of Engliſhmen could beat his " Pruſſians—' I cannot tell,' replied the am- " baſſador, ' whether an equal number would " beat them, but I am certain half the number " would try.' "

This anſwer of our ambaſſador has been long celebrated as a prompt and ſpirited reply to a queſtion neither fair nor polite; and if, by putting it into print, the Biſhop of Landaff has betrayed a little excuſable partiality to his countrymen, Mr. Wakefield has taken particular care to run moſt unpardonably into the oppoſite extreme.

*Rep.* p. 34.—" The Auſtrian ſquadrons, and " Hungarian infantry, with whoſe martial cha- " racter the fineſt troops of Britain, in the " opinion of thoſe troops themſelves, at the " ſiege of Valenciennes, could venture no " compariſon; they, I ſay, would peruſe, *be-* " *yond all controverſy*, this extravagance of na- " tional vanity with a ſmile of ineffable con- " tempt—how much more their conquerors?"

Not

Not knowing where Mr. Wakefield gets his information on military matters, I have no reaſon to allow it to be better than my own. I have often been in company with military men, foreigners as well as Engliſh, among whom to compare the merit of the troops of different nations is no uncommon topic of converſation. Some troops have been repreſented to be diſtinguiſhable for impetuoſity, others for firmneſs, and others for readineſs in rallying; and, upon the whole, for the conſtant diſcharge of *all* the duties of a ſoldier, whether in quarters, camp, garriſons, trenches, or battle, the preference was generally allowed to the Germans; but, upon full recollection, I can ſafely aver, for the honour of my country, that I never heard it even inſinuated, that for perſonal valour in time of action (and to this the ambaſſador's anſwer points) the Engliſh troops were inferior to any.

*Add.* pp. 16, 17.—" Many honeſt men, I " am ſenſible, have been alarmed into a belief, " that, were the French to invade this country, " they would be joined by *great numbers* of diſ- " contented men. This is not my opinion."

*Rep.* pp. 35, 36.—" On the contrary, I am " fully ſatisfied, that if the French could land a

" con-

" conſiderable army (ſay 70,000 men), the " kingdom would be loſt for ever. The *ſame* " *cauſe* which facilitated the progreſs of the re- " publicans on the continent, *would operate as* " *powerfully* for them in this country alſo: " namely, a degree of poverty and wretchedneſs " in the lower orders of the community, which, " eſpecially in their preſent ſtate of depravity " and ignorance, will render the chances, even " from confuſion, of any change deſirable."

It is for this place that I have reſerved my examination of Mr. Wakefield's ſentiments, relative to the inferior orders of the people: the ſubject has been much canvaſſed and much miſrepreſented, and well merits an attentive inveſtigation. I will endeavour not to be tedious; but every candid reader will recollect, that it is leſs difficult to make twenty groundleſs aſſertions, than to eſtabliſh one diſputed truth by reaſonable proofs *. The depravity, ignorance, and miſerable poverty of the inferior orders, are ſtated by Mr. Wakefield to be the cauſes which facilitated the progreſs of the French armies on the continent, which cauſes, he ſuppoſes, would operate as powerfully in this country.

* For the preſent I mean to ſpeak of the common people in the country only. London will be conſidered ſeparately.

If

If the common people were even more immoral in England than on the continent, it might be truly pleaded in their excuſe, that in no country of Europe have they the ſame temptations and means of indulging their appetites; for in no other country of Europe is there ſo great a variety of the articles of gratification, or ſo liberal a payment of every kind of labour, from the moſt ingenious artiſan to the commoneſt huſbandman.

But are the people of England, in fact, equally depraved by ſuch vices as are likely to make them join an enemy?

Mr. Wakefield has aſſumed the affirmative to this queſtion. To refute him, it would be neceſſary to have recourſe to credible calculations of the population of the reſpective countries, with accurate liſts of the criminals accuſed or puniſhed. Such documents are not to be procured; and, without them, it is not poſſible to approach to conviction on either ſide. Moſt of us might certainly lead better lives than we do; but, being myſelf diſpoſed to think favourably of my countrymen, I will not admit that they are even as bad as other nations; and, by the laws of argument, an aſſertion unſup-

ported by proof (which is not in this caſe to be had) is ſufficiently anſwered by a contradiction.

In charging the common people of England with ignorance, I preſume, Mr. Wakefield means religious ignorance. It does not appear to what extent he carries his notion of this kind of ignorance; but I am ready to allow that our common people are not every where ſo intelligibly inſtructed in the principles, or ſo earneſtly exhorted to the practice, of their religious duties, as it is to be wiſhed they were: yet were our clergy to labour ever ſo ardently and perſeveringly in their vocation, the common people muſt, from their education and neceſſary habits of life, take many of the important points of the chriſtian doctrine upon truſt. Of the preceptive part of our religion, the common people, as far as my own obſervation has gone, are not ignorant; in general, they (like their ſuperiors in ſituation and knowledge) err leſs from the head than the heart. I have heard one ſcold reprove another out of the ſcripture; and I perfectly recollect ſeeing a ſoldier, one of Mr. Wakefield's "profligate mercenaries," jump up from the ground, and thank God for his good dinner with more marks of heart-felt gratitude than I have often diſcovered in a more dignified or long-winded thankſgiving. I have ſeen many

witneſſes

witneſſes perjuring themſelves in the opinion of all who heard them, but very few without ſtrong ſymptoms of conſcious guilt: theſe may, however, be imputed to the fear of detection and puniſhment. But, it is obſervable, that young witneſſes (ſay under twenty) very rarely forſwear themſelves; and of ſeveral children that I have ſeen examined, I do not remember one that was even ſuſpected of perjury. From this I infer that the children of our common people are not left ſo groſſly untaught, as is too generally and uncharitably ſuppoſed; nor will I believe that ſhort but ſerious notions of God's love or anger, of future reward or puniſhment, once imbibed in youth, are often *eradicated* from the mind by any temptation or evil example.

Further: admitting our common people to be *ignorant* of their religion, they are certainly not *indifferent* to it; witneſs the uſual unpopularity of any act of Parliament for extending the immunities of the Romiſh or any other diſſenters; and the ready zeal ſhown on ſuch occaſions by the common people to ſupport the rights of the Church, although the parſon be not always a favourite character in the pariſh. I am far from meaning to juſtify any perſecuting riots; but ſurely theſe obſervations ſhow that the French are likely to be leſs favourably received, from its

being known that they would moſt certainly overturn our church eſtabliſhment, and our preſent form of worſhip.

If the ignorance, charged by Mr. Wakefield, is to be underſtood of *civil* rights, I cannot but think the imputation is wholly unfounded.

On this ſubject I appeal with confidence to common experience. Let every one of my readers aſk himſelf, if, in their various dealings with artiſans, ſervants, or labourers, they have found them either ignorant of their rights, or backward in maintaining them.

The common people of this country well know, and I hope feel with proper pride, that they live under the protection of equal and beneficial laws, deliberately made and impartially executed. They have a competent and often an acute knowledge of the proviſions of thoſe laws which more particularly relate to themſelves, are well aware of every expreſſion in their favour, and ſometimes ſucceed in gaining a ſtrictly legal advantage over, perhaps, the more equitable plea of their employers or maſters, in ſpite of any diſtinction in rank, fortune, or education. In diſputes about their agreements, debts, or wages, do the labouring people ſhow any diffidence in applying to the

proper

proper tribunals? where, notwithſtanding that an act of Parliament frequently requires much nice inveſtigation and reaſoning, yet, if the loſing party is not pleaſed, the by-ſtanders at leaſt are generally ſatisfied with the deciſion. All this is, I admit, nothing more than what ſhould be. But in what country of Italy, or on the banks of the Rhine, could the common people boaſt of ſimilar privileges and advantages? Subject as thoſe people were to a code of laws oppreſſive and uncertain in themſelves, no ſuitor could be ſure, that in his own caſe even theſe laws would not be violated by the ſovereign, the lord, the ſteward, or, in ſhort, as the malice, or intereſt, or caprice, of any magiſtrate might ſuggeſt. Here then, at leaſt, there is not the ſame cauſe to facilitate the progreſs of the French in England, that there was on the continent. Few rights are ſo dear to a people, as the right of maintaining the poſſeſſion of their property, and enforcing a juſt demand. Every individual in England knows that he *now* holds theſe rights; what will become of them in the confuſion of French conqueſt or French fraternization?

In ſpeaking of the poverty of the people, Mr. Wakefield joins wretchedneſs with penury; I therefore preſume that he means to be under-

underſtood to ſpeak of the *neceſſitous* poor, thoſe who are poor even to a want of the neceſſaries of life. This is not the ſituation of thoſe who can only ſupport themſelves by their daily labour; for they *do* ſupport themſelves, and in general not uncomfortably. Compared indeed with thoſe, who have ſome property beyond their daily wants, they may be called poor. But the day-labourer and artiſan need not, except through ſickneſs or indiſcretion, feel diſtreſs; and even if he does, inſtead of begging for charity, he may *demand* relief. Was this the ſtate of the working people on the continent? Is there (England excepted) any country in Europe, be its extent or population ever ſo great, in which the rich are obliged by law to raiſe for the uſe of the poor £3,000,000 a year *, excluſive of large charitable foundations, and the private alms of individuals †? which laſt,

* I cannot immediately refer to any ſtate of the amount of the poor-rate; but I believe my eſtimate is below the real ſum.

† It lies out of my way, but I wiſh ſome of my readers to inquire, if any of the patriotic ſocieties, who profeſs to be ſo tremblingly alive to the diſtreſſes of the common people, have ever done much towards relieving thoſe diſtreſſes in a pecuniary way. I have not heard that the "Correſponding Society," or the ſociety of the "Friends of the People," have ever correſponded with certain other ſocieties, who

laſt, I may boldly ſay, are not unworthy of the opulence and character of the Engliſh nation.

But theſe human laws—the work of man—muſt, both in their proviſions and execution, partake of his imperfection. Reaſoning from the Statute-book, I might ſafely aſſert, that there *ought* to be no neceſſitous ſuffering poor in the kingdom: but I am not ſo ignorant or prejudiced as to think that there *are* none. Sudden ſickneſs, the diſtant reſidence of a magiſtrate, the neglect or obduracy of an overſeer, the intemperance or improvidence of a family*, muſt produce inſtances of great temporary diſtreſs, even to pining want,

"Where the lone widow and her orphans pine
"In ſtarving ſolitude."

---

who ſeem to be no leſs friendly to the people; ſuch as, the "Society for bettering the State of the Poor; the Phi-"lanthropic Society; the Society for the Relief of Perſons "impriſoned for ſmall Debts." At public dinners collections are ſometimes made for very laudable purpoſes; I have not heard of any ſuch collections at any of the patriotic anniverſaries.

* People who do not learn the ſtate of the poor in their ſtudies, but from their own perſonal obſervation, know that almoſt in every pariſh there are certain families who live in apparent comfort upon the ſame means, which do not keep other families, under the ſame circumſtances, out of frequent want. Thoſe, except in time of great ſcarcity, never call for aid; whilſt no aſſiſtance can make the latter comfortable.

But in England ſuch inſtances are, I truſt, extremely rare, and may juſtly be ſet down among the irremediable evils of human life. Nor does this admiſſion on my part by any means extend to the point in diſpute. For Mr. Wakefield ſtates poverty to be a cauſe which "facilitated the progreſs of the French "abroad," and aſſerts that it will operate as *powerfully* in this country. I doubt if it would operate at all—out of London I mean. But at any rate, a cauſe, to operate equally, muſt have equal power. Now, without inſerting what I have heard of the ſituation of the labouring people of Savoy, Piedmont, and other parts of Italy, or in Germany; it is not credible, without abſolute proof, that the ſame degree, or any thing like the ſame degree of poverty can prevail in a country where £3,000,000 are raiſed annually to relieve it, as in countries where nothing is raiſed.

Upon the whole, therefore, of this queſtion, I deny that the cauſes, ſuggeſted by Mr. Wakefield to have operated on the continent, can operate equally in this country; becauſe thoſe cauſes do not exiſt here in an equal degree; and becauſe there are other cauſes likely to counteract their operation.

*Rep.*

*Rep.* p. 36. "I believe from my ſoul, that "within three miles of this houſe, where I am "writing theſe pages, there is a much greater "number of ſtarving, miſerable human beings, "the hopeleſs victims of penury and diſtreſs, "than on any equal portion of ground through "the habitable globe."

This ſolemn aſſeveration might be ſafely extended to fat men and lean, tall men and ſhort, &c. &c.; for Mr. Wakefield's houſe happens to be within three miles of London, where, to be ſure, more human beings of every deſcription are to be found than on any equal portion of ground on the habitable globe. I ſhould not, however, have made this trifling remark, but that I feared ſome inattentive reader, not noticing that the reply is dated from Hackney, might ſuppoſe this paſſage to be applicable, indifferently, to any part of the kingdom.

With reſpect to the poor of London, we all know that the ſame legal means of preventing and relieving diſtreſs are uſed there as in other parts of the kingdom; but I do not pretend to ſay that they have the ſame good effect. On the contrary, I fear that in London there are many who ſuffer the miſery of

even temporary *want*. This cannot, however, I am ſatisfied, be juſtly imputed either to any defect in the laws or in the adminiſtration of them, or to any decreaſe of private bounty. Generally ſpeaking, theſe unhappy objects are ſuch as dare not bring their characters to light, and are yet unable to ſubſiſt by their uſual bad practices; or ſuch as waſte their liberal wages, or a reaſonable weekly allowance, in two or three days. In one pariſh*, I ſpeak from my own knowledge, the poor are properly aſſiſted and provided for. I *believe* the ſame to be the caſe in the other pariſhes, and for this reaſon: the blameleſs poor of London, thoſe who dare ſhow themſelves, would not be long patient or ſilent under oppreſſion or great diſtreſs; for being very numerous, they would ſoon find means of making their own grievances, and the miſbehaviour of the pariſh officers, too notorious to be perſiſted in.

But there is no need for me to purſue this inquiry further, becauſe I will admit the concluſion which Mr. Wakefield means to draw from his aſſertion; namely, that there is in the metropolis a great number of the common people, who, through poverty, idleneſs, vice, or guilt, would, in time of invaſion, be very ready

* St. George, Hanover Square.

either

either to raiſe riots or go over to the enemy, as either plan might ſeem beſt ſuited to their purpoſes of outrage and plunder.

To join the French in any numbers would not however be eaſy, perhaps not poſſible; for all communication between the enemy and London would be immediately and watchfully prevented: not indeed through any fear of the populace of London making a military diverſion, but becauſe London muſt be a principal poſt of defence.

To ſuppreſs riots, or rather to hinder any large bodies of the people from collecting together, muſt be left to the vigilance of Government and the perſonal exertions of the inhabitants. Some regular troops will of courſe be ſtationed in London, where alſo a conſiderable number of inhabitants have lately been trained to arms. Theſe laſt indeed, Mr. Wakefield takes for granted, would fly on the firſt appearance of the French. But he may, perhaps, allow that they would endeavour to defend their property againſt a mob. And whoever recollects the riots of 1780, when a mob, after having triumphed many days in unoppoſed violence, totally diſappeared in a few hours before an inconſiderable body of

troops left at liberty to do their duty, will not have great fears about the event. The country would not therefore (I truſt) "*be loſt for* "*ever.*"

Mr. Wakefield cloſes this head of his Reply with the fable of "the ſenſible aſs," which would not fly from an enemy, becauſe he muſt ſtill carry his panniers as uſual. The application of this fable Mr. Wakefield, I preſume, thinks may be of ſingular ſervice, by diſſuading the common people from taking any part in the defence of their country.

*Rep.* p. 37.—*The Application.*

"This fable ſhews us, how much in the "wrong the poorer ſort of people moſt com- "monly are, when they are under any concern "about the revolutions of a government. All "the alteration which they can feel is, perhaps, "in the name of their ſovereign, or ſome ſuch "important trifle; but they cannot well be "poorer, or made to work harder than they "did before."

Here I ſhall introduce an application of *this* application. This is, I believe, a novelty in literature; but it may paſs among the other novelties

novelties of the times, and will ſave me ſome trouble.

*Application of the Application.*

This application ſhews us, that if the poorer ſort of people are moſt commonly in the wrong, when they are under any concern about the revolutions of a government; they muſt of courſe be in the wrong, when they pay any attention to thoſe weak, wicked, twopenny publications, that have been ſo induſtriouſly circulated in order to perſuade them that they are very unhappy under their preſent government, and would be much happier if they overturned it.

This application further ſhews, that the fable is not at all applicable to the people of England, who *may* be worſe off than they are at preſent. For ſhould the French ruin this country in the manner they threaten to do, and have in fact dealt by every country within their reach, there will be fewer perſons able to employ ſo many workmen, or pay them ſo well as they do at preſent; ſo that the working people will have both leſs work and leſs wages.

*Add.* p. 37. — " Does it follow that there " ought to be no diſtinction in ſociety, with " reſpect

" reſpect to rank or riches, becauſe there are " none in a ſtate of nature ?"

*Rep.* p. 38.—" It follows, I think, moſt un- " queſtionably, that no diſtinctions in ſociety " ſhould prevail, but what ariſe from per- " ſonal merit and public ſervices. That the " father's honours, which have been juſtly paid " him, ſhould be regularly tranſmitted to his " undeſerving children, is a ſtupidity, I ſhould " think, which few will be forward to defend. " An advocate for inequality like this, ſhall " receive no commendations at my hands. " He deſerves well neither of humanity nor the " goſpel."

To ſpeak in ſuch very deciſive terms of a regulation adopted by every conſiderable ſtate in Europe, except perhaps the Turkiſh government, marks no moderate ſhare of overweening ſelf-ſufficiency and poſitiveneſs. I do not ſay that Mr. Wakefield meant to extend his poſition to the deſcent of the crown, but, unqualified as it is, it certainly goes that length.

" Honours (ſays Mr. J. Blackſtone *) reward " ſuch as are eminent for their ſervices to the

* Comment. b. i. p. 157. 4to edit.

" public,

" public, in a manner the moſt deſirable to " individuals, and yet without burden to the " community; exciting an ambitious yet " laudable ardour, and generous emulation in " others." And it is obvious that this reward and excitement are greatly augmented by their being made hereditary, and ſtill without burden to the public.

Confining my Examination to the peerage of England, I obſerve, that it is a diſtinction which not only confers honour but enjoins certain duties. It is the duty of our Houſe of Lords to preſervethe ſtability of the conſtitution, to ſtop haſty ſchemes of innovation, to act as a council of control, to deliberate rather than to propoſe. Now, is it not more likely that theſe duties ſhould be faithfully and ſteadily performed by a nobility, who are intereſted to keep the conſtitution in its preſent form*, under which their poſterity will inherit certain ad-

* By the expreſſion, " preſent form," I mean the fundamental ſyſtem or compoſition of a government. To partial improvements every ſyſtem ought to be open; none is more ſo than our own; none has, in fact, been more improved. But *ſtability* is one of the moſt deſirable qualities in any ſyſtem of government: for the overthrow even of a bad government ſeldom compenſates the unavoidable miſchiefs of ſuch a convulſion, and never produces all the good that was expected.

vantages;

vantages; than by a nobility, who, as nobles, would have no concern in what may happen to the country after their death? Are not nobles thus circumſtanced, leſs likely to ſacrifice eſtabliſhed principles to party meaſures, than nobles, who, having by their own perſonal exertions raiſed themſelves to honours which die with them, may be tempted at all hazards to make the moſt of their ſituation whilſt they live? In juſtifying the law of forfeiture, Mr. J. Blackſtone quotes the following paſſage from Cicero: "*Nec vero me fugit quam ſit acerbum,* "*parentum ſcelera filiorum pœnis lui: ſed hoc præ-* "*clare legibus comparatum eſt, ut caritas liberorum* "*amiciores parentes reipublicæ redderet.*" The expediency of forfeiture, and hereditary honours, ſeem to ſtand both on the ſame ground, the nature of the human heart.

*Rep.* p. 38.—"To the remarks of the Biſhop "on the ſubject of religion, I beg leave, in the "main, to ſubſcribe my teſtimony of concur-"rence and approbation, as far as they are "explicit."

No part of the Reply has given me ſo much pleaſure as theſe four lines. For they relieve me from entering into any arguments on points of religion; a taſk, to which I ſhould have felt myſelf

myſelf perfectly unequal, eſpecially in any diſpute between the Biſhop of Landaff and Mr. Wakefield.

Mr. Wakefield has, indeed, under favour of the qualifying words, "*as far as they are explicit*," contrived to make a very violent and contemptuous attack upon our eſtabliſhed church; but this I regard merely as a ſudden and excurſive effuſion of a tolerant ſpirit, wholly unconnected with the Biſhop's Addreſs, and therefore not calling upon me for any anſwer or remark.

*Add.* pp. 41, 42.—"I am not altogether inſenſible of the danger I may have incurred (ſhould matters come to extremity) by thus publicly addreſſing my countrymen. I might have concealed my ſentiments, and waited in retirement, till the ſtruggle had been over, and the iſſue known; but I diſdain ſafety accompanied with diſhonour. When Hannibal is at the gates, who but a poltroon would liſten to the timid counſels of neutrality, or attempt to ſcreen himſelf from the calamity coming on his country, by ſkulking as a vagabond amid the mountains of Wales or of Weſtmoreland? I am ready, and I am perſuaded that I entertain a juſt confidence in ſaying, that hundreds of thouſands of

" loyal and honeſt men are as ready as I am, " to hazard every thing in defence of the " country."

*Rep.* p. 42.—" On a ſubject of this kind, " a man can only undertake to anſwer for him- " ſelf."

Perfectly true. And Mr. Wakefield ſhould have thought of this, when he undertook to transform the Biſhop of Landaff into Ulyſſes, and to make the volunteer corps ſpeak the cowardly language of the Satyrs in the Cyclops. But at preſent, if I ſhould fancy that I ſaw, in what Mr. Wakefield ſays for himſelf, an opportunity of amuſing my readers by propoſing that he ſhould play Therſites to the Biſhop's Ulyſſes, or of putting into Mr. Wakefield's mouth ſome of the claſſical ribaldry of Ariſtophanes, would he have any juſt right to complain? It is not however my deſign to follow Mr. Wakefield's example; his ſucceſs in the comic ſtyle is not encouraging. Beſides, no humourous retort occurs to me at this moment, and I ſhall not poach for pleaſantry in Euripides.

Seriouſly then, let us hear what Mr. Wakefield ſays for himſelf.

Mr. Wakefield ſays, " that he is not one of the " hundreds of thouſands ſo very loyal and ſo " very

" very honeſt as the Biſhop of Landaff. If the
" French come, they ſhall find him (Mr.
" Wakefield) at his poſt, a watchful centinel
" in his proper box, *his ſtudy*, among the ve-
" nerable dead, turning the dark lantern of
" heathen records, or trimming the everlaſting
" lamp of Moſes, &c. &c. He, with other
" *ſons of peace*, ſee that great revolutions are
" accompliſhing, and will wait the event with
" trembling hope, but with a firm and tranquil
" reſignation.——If he ſaw a government,
" whether monarchical or republican, devoted
" to the moral and intellectual melioration of
" its ſubjects, ſteadily bent on the promotion
" of their temporal comfort and accommoda-
" tion, by beneficent and equal laws, *that* go-
" vernment ſhould find him as zealous and
" uniform in its ſupport, as the moſt forward
" of its champions. But when called upon to
" defend a degenerate conſtitution of ideal ex-
" cellence and practical depravity, he revolts
" at the audacious impoſition, and pities the
" underſtanding that can be duped by ſuch
" deſpicable artifice."

What Mr. Wakefiled ſays for himſelf fills about four pages; I have, therefore, not inſerted the whole. It comprehends his intended conduct, and his motives for that conduct. I do not mean to examine either; for his motives have

all (as I think) been examined already, at leaſt as far as they apply to the Biſhop of Landaff's Addreſs; and I cannot hope to alter his intentions.

The ſum and ſubſtance amount to this: that for a conſtitution, ſuch as he has deſcribed and would approve, but ſuch as I believe never did and never will exiſt, Mr. Wakefield would do a great deal; but for the preſent conſtitution of England he will do nothing—a determination which does not ſeem to be either very laudable in him or ſerviceable to others.

I am now come to the concluſion of the Reply, which is very judiciouſly placed at the end inſtead of the beginning of the work. For although containing, as it does, the whole ſubſtance and deſign of the pamphlet, it might with equal propriety have been printed in the firſt page, as the theme for the ſubſequent declamation; yet as many readers, after having once peruſed the theme, might not have been deſirous of purſuing the ſubject through all the ſucceeding ſheets, the concluſion or theme, for it may ſerve as either, is upon the whole better where it now ſtands.

Proceed we now to the matter of the concluſion.

*Rep.* p. 49.—"Change your miniſtry, reſtore "your conſtitution, correct your abuſes, and "calm your ſpirit: then, I ſay, ſolicit peace; "and take my word for it, the French repub-"lic, ſo far from inſiſting on any conceſſions "of humiliation and diſgrace, will come for-"wards to embrace you," &c. &c.

And this is Mr. Wakefield's language to the people of England!

We have heard, my readers, of Cecil and Walſingham, Clarendon and Sommers, of Walpole, Granville, Murray, and Chatham: theſe men, in their turns, directed or aſſiſted in your councils: did any one of them, when in the zenith of power and glory, ever preſume to addreſs the nation in terms of ſuch dictatorial haughtineſs and peremptory admonition?

"Change your miniſtry, reſtore your con-"ſtitution, correct your abuſes, and calm your "ſpirit: then ſolicit peace; and take my word "for it;" take *whoſe* word for it?—Mr. Wakefield's.—Take Mr. *Wakefield*'s word for France making peace with England!—All indignation ſubſides: the arrogance of the paſſage is loſt in its puerile abſurdity.—Methinks I hear ſome good old motherly peace-maker calling out—"Come, come, little folks, do as I bid you; "no

" no more quarrelling or fighting, but kiſs and " be friends; and you can't think how merry " we'll all be!"—When the ſequeſtered ſtudent, become a ſelf-made ſtateſman, uſes the arguments, he ſhould at the ſame time adopt the language of the nurſery.

*Rep.* pp. 50, 51.—" In ſhort, the circum- " ſtances of the time moſt imperiouſly de- " mand the interference of THAT MAN, who, " for diffuſive political wiſdom, gentleneſs of " nature, and genuine philanthropy, unalloyed " by a ſingle particle of bitterneſs, animoſity, " or reſentment, has not, and perhaps never " had, a ſuperior among his ſpecies," &c. &c.

And is it come to this at laſt! After profeſſing his reverence for patriotiſm and truth, and queſtioning the Biſhop of Landaff's claim to independence; after pronouncing the preſent conteſt to be between principles, not parties; after exalting himſelf into a ſtateſman, whoſe bare word is the pledge of peace, and cajoling the multitude by ſtyling himſelf their meſſmate; does Mr. Wakefield thus finiſh his career on the broad highway of political pamphleteering, ſo regularly trodden by every literary candidate for the favour of a would-be miniſter? Profeſſions of patriotiſm, virulent invective againſt the abuſes of government, more virulent in-

vective

vective againſt the miniſter himſelf, outrageous outcry for reform, with a peroration recommendatory of the oppoſition leader, in the moſt fulſome ſtrain of adulation: ſuch are, and long have been, the ſtale hacknied topics of every diſcontented expecter's declamation! And are we thus to be cheated into a belief, that a new miniſtry will give us thoſe laws and liberties, that peace and ſafety, which, without a new miniſtry, are not worth fighting for? It is here my turn "to revolt at ſuch an auda-"cious impoſition, and to pity the under-"ſtanding that can be duped by ſuch deſpi-"cable artifice *."

I now cloſe this Examination: it is for my readers to chooſe for themſelves.

Will they liſten to the Addreſs of the *intereſted* Biſhop of Landaff, who exhorts them to ſave their country from pillage and anarchy? or will they rank with the followers of the ſequeſtered ſtudent, who writes to inculcate tame ſubmiſſion to an implacable enemy, and to recommend Mr. Fox to be prime miniſter?

* See p. 59.

FINIS.

DEDICATED, BY PERMISSION, TO THE
*Right Honourable the EARL of LIVERPOOL.*

---

Preparing for the Preſs, and will be Publiſhed by Subſcription, with all convenient Speed, neatly printed on a ſuperfine wove cream-coloured Paper, and hot-preſſed; in one Volume, 4to.; embelliſhed with Maps, Plans, Views, &c.

THE

# HISTORY

OF

# LIVERPOOL,

*From the earlieſt Period to the preſent Time;*

WITH

*SOME NOTICE*

OF ITS

## ENVIRONS:

TO WHICH WILL BE ADDED,

AN ACCOUNT

OF THE

# RIVER MERSEY,

FROM

*Its Source to the Sea;*

WITH

A SKETCH OF THE PRINCIPAL OBJECTS

ON

*ITS BANKS.*

---

**London:**
PRINTED FOR JOHN STOCKDALE, PICCADILLY.

---

An early Notice from any Gentleman who may be inclined to contribute towards the Expenſe of engraving any particular View of his Seat, Church, &c. will be eſteemed a Favour.

The Work will be publiſhed by Subſcription, and a Liſt of the Subſcribers will be printed.

Subſcribers Names will alſo be received by Mr. GORE, *Liverpool*—Meſſrs. CLARKES, and Mr. HARROP, *Mancheſter*—Mr. REDDISH, *Stockport*—Mr. COCKER, *Ormſkirk*—Mrs. POOLE and SON, *Cheſter*—Mrs. BANKS, *Warrington*—Mr. TAYLOR, *Preſcot*—and Mr. SNELSON, *Nimptwich*.

10*th February*, 1798. *In*